



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/612,914	07/10/2000	Nabil Hanna	012712-905	9512

909 7590 07/17/2002  
PILLSBURY WINTHROP, LLP  
P.O. BOX 10500  
MCLEAN, VA 22102

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

YAEN, CHRISTOPHER H

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

1642

DATE MAILED: 07/17/2002

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/612,914	HANNA ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Christopher H Yaen	1642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM

#### THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed

- after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2002.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-16,22 and 28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 17-21,23-27 and 29-36 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. The examiner of the application has changed. This case has now been transferred as of 6/25/02. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Christopher Yaen,

Group Art Unit 1642.

2. Applicant's amendment to the specification is acknowledged and entered.
3. Claims 1-36 are pending. Claims 1-16 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Claims 17-36 are examined on the merits to the extent that they read on the elected species (claims 17-21, 23-27, and 29-36).

***Election/Restrictions***

4. Applicant's election without traverse of group IV in Paper No. 6 is acknowledged.

***Claim Objections***

5. Claims are objected to because of the following informalities:
  - a. Claims are in dependent form referring to claims of a non-elected invention (claims 22 and 28).

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Application/Control Number: 09/612,914

Art Unit: 1642

7. Claims 19, 25, 31, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

8. In regard to claims 19, 25, 31, and 34, SEQ ID Nos. are not associated with the claimed biotechnology data. Appropriate correction is required.

9. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

10. Claims 17-21,23-27, and 29-36 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to practice the method of treating or preventing autoimmune disorders or non-autoimmune disorders with a chimeric antibody, because the specification has not taught one of skill in the art that the antibody disclosed in the instant invention has therapeutic efficacy.

The first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 states, "The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same...". The courts have interpreted this to mean that the specification must enable

one skilled in the art to make and use the invention without undue experimentation. The courts have further interpreted undue experimentation as requiring "ingenuity beyond that to be expected of one of ordinary skill in the art" (Fields v. Conover, 170 USPQ 276 (CCPA 1971)) or requiring an extended period of experimentation in the absence of sufficient direction or guidance (In re Colianni, 195 USPQ 150 (CCPA 1977)). Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have been described in In re Colianni, 195 USPQ 150, 153 (CCPA 1977) and have been clarified by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in Ex parte Forman, 230 USPQ 546 (BPAI 1986). Among the factors are the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the predictability or lack thereof in the art, the amount of direction or guidance present, the presence or absence of working examples, the breadth of the claims, and the quantity of experimentation needed.

The nature of the invention: The claimed invention is drawn to a method of treating or preventing a CD4 related condition comprising the administration of a chimeric antibody comprising a VH and VL chain sequence from an Old World monkey and an Fc heavy and Fc light chain sequence from a human, wherein the conditions are autoimmune disease and non-autoimmune disease (transplant rejection).

The state of the prior art and the predictability or lack thereof in the art: The art teaches that monoclonal antibodies show promise for the treatment of autoimmune and non-autoimmune diseases. However, the art at the time the invention was made fails to describe with any certainty that chimeric antibodies in general are capable of effective

Application/Control Number: 09/612,914

Art Unit: 1642

treating or preventing autoimmune or non-autoimmune disease. One such example taught in the art, Ren EC (Ann Acad Med Singapore 1991 Jan;20(1):66-70) teaches that although monoclonal antibodies may potentially have therapeutic efficacy, they are still no effective due to host rejection. Further, Ren EC teaches that alternative forms of antibodies can be used, such as humanized antibodies, and have more promising effects over chimeric antibodies. Furthermore, Ren EC teaches that chimeric antibodies are less effective (immunogenic) in patients and that humanized antibodies are preferred. No where in the art does it each that chimeric antibodies are capable of preventing

The amount of direction or guidance present and the presence or absence of working examples: The specification does not teach how to practice or use the chimeric antibody of the instant invention as a therapeutic or prophylactic agent against autoimmune or non-autoimmune diseases. Furthermore, the instant specification has not taught one of skill in the art the methodological steps needed to practice the invention in terms of treating or preventing autoimmune or non-autoimmune diseases (transplant rejection) that have therapeutic effects. The working examples are drawn to the pharmacological kinetics, the effects of chimeric anti-CD4 antibody on non depletion of CD4 population of cells, the Fc receptor binding affinity of the chimeric antibody, and in vitro effects of the antibody. No working examples are provided for the treatment or prevention of autoimmune or non-autoimmune diseases that have therapeutic or prophylactic efficacy.

Application/Control Number: 09/612,914

Art Unit: 1642

The breadth of the claims and the quantity of experimentation needed: Given the breadth of the claims, which includes treatment or prevention of autoimmune diseases and non-autoimmune disease through the administration a chimeric anti-CD4 antibody, and absent sufficient teachings in the specification to overcome the teachings of unpredictability found in the art, it would require undue experimentation by one of skill in the art to be able to practice the invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

11. Claims 21 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claims 21 and 27 are drawn to a method of treating or preventing through the administration of a specific antibody.

It is apparent that the recited antibody is required to practice the claimed invention, because they are specifically required in the claims. As required elements they must be known and readily available to the public or obtainable by a repeatable method set forth in the specification, or otherwise readily available to the public. If it is not so obtainable or available, the enablement requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, may be satisfied through a deposit of the antibody or hybridoma listed in claim 21. See 37 CFR 1.802.

The specification does not provide a repeatable method for obtaining the antibody of claim 7, and they do not appear to be readily available material. Deposit of the cell lines that produces the antibody would satisfy the enablement requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112.

Application/Control Number: 09/612,914

Art Unit: 1642

If a deposit is made under the terms of the Budapest Treaty, then an affidavit or declaration by applicants or someone associated with the patent owner who is in a position to make such assurances, or a statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature, stating that the deposit has been made under the terms of the Budapest Treaty and that all restrictions imposed by the depositor on the availability to the public of the deposited material will be irrevocably removed upon the granting of a patent, would satisfy the deposit requirements. See 37 CFR 1.808.

If a deposit is not made under the terms of the Budapest Treaty, then an affidavit or declaration by applicants or someone associated with the patent owner who is in a position to make such assurances, or a statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature, stating that the deposit has been made at an acceptable depository and that the following criteria have been met:

- (a) during the pendency of this application, access to the invention will be afforded to one determined by the Commissioner to be entitled thereto;
- (b) all restrictions imposed by the depositor on the availability to the public of the deposited material will be irrevocably removed upon granting of the patent;
- (c) the deposit will be maintained for a term of at least thirty (30) years and at least five (5) years after the most recent request for the furnishing of a sample of the deposited material;
- (d) a viability statement in accordance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.807;

and

Application/Control Number: 09/612,914

Art Unit: 1642

(e) the deposit will be replaced should it become necessary due to inviability, contamination or loss of capability to function in the manner described in the specification.

In addition the identifying information set forth in 37 CFR 1.809(d) should be added to the specification. See 37 CFR 1.803 - 37 CFR 1.809 for additional explanation of these requirements.

### ***Double Patenting***

12. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

13. Claims 17, 23, and 29 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 5,756,096. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the instant application are encompassed by the prior U.S. Patent, wherein the scope of both inventions are identical. Both the instant claims and the issued claims are drawn to a method of treating a CD4 related

Application/Control Number: 09/612,914

Art Unit: 1642

disease through the administration of a chimeric antibody, wherein the disease is an autoimmune disease, more specifically rheumatoid arthritis, and wherein the antibody comprises variable domains from a Old World monkey and constant region from a human.

***Conclusion***

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher H Yaen whose telephone number is 703-305-3586. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Caputa can be reached on 703-308-3995. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-4242 for regular communications and 703-305-3014 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

Christopher Yaen  
Art Unit 1642  
June 29, 2002

*Brenda Brumback*  
BRENDA BRUMBACK  
PATENT EXAMINER  
PRIMARY